

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Pat nt and Trademark Office

Acr.

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.		
09/446.991	02/04/00	LEIMAND		Н	CU-	2078RJS
_		MM92/0905	一 .	EXAMINER		
THOMAS F PETERSON				YAN.R		
LADAS & PARRY				ART U	INIT	PAPER NUMBER
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE CHICAGO IL 60604			•	2854		
				DATE MAI	LED: 09	/05/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/446,991

Applicant(s)

Leimand

Examiner

Ren Yan

Group Art Unit 2854

Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 4, 2000	<u> </u>
☐ This action is FINAL .	
in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle	
is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. F	s set to expire <u>3</u> month(s), or thirty days, whichever ailure to respond within the period for response will cause the extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of
Disposition of Claims	
	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration
Claim(s)	
☐ Claim(s)	
	are subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent D The drawing(s) filed on	is approved disapproved. iner. driority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). opies of the priority documents have been dial Number) om the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Pa Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, P	aper No(s)6
SEE OFFICE ACTIO	N ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES

Office Action Summary

Application/Control Number: 09/446,991

Art Unit: 2854

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The present specification does not provide headings for the various sections it contains.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout and content for patent applications. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

The following order or arrangement is preferred in framing the specification and, except for the reference to "Microfiche Appendix" and the drawings, each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as section headings. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) Title of the Invention.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research or Development.
- (d) Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix" (see 37 CFR 1.96).
- (e) Background of the Invention.
 - 1. Field of the Invention.
 - 2. Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention.
- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s).
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention.
- (i) Claim or Claims (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) Drawings.
- (1) Sequence Listing (see 37 CFR 1.821-1.825).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/446,991

Art Unit: 2854

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 is vague and indefinite because there is no positive method step being recited in this method claim. All it contains is a functional use statement of a device. The steps which go to make up the method must be clearly and positively specified and must be organized and correlated in such a manner so to present a complete operative method.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GB 2,119,711('711 patent) in view of EP 0,574,124('124 patent). The '711 patent teaches the method and structure of a printing unit as claimed including a dampening device for selectively supplying lacquer or moistening liquid to a plate cylinder 6. See the entire '711 patent for details. The dampening device of the '711 patent uses a wiper 12(doctor blade as known in the art) but the detailed streatre of such a wiper is not illustrated. The '124 patent teaches in a rotary offset printing machine the conventionality of using a doctor blade chamber device of the same structure as claimed in the present application to supply coating liquid or ink. See Figs. 4 and 7-9 in '124

Application/Control Number: 09/446,991

Art Unit: 2854

patent for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the dampening device of the '711 patent with a doctor blade chamber device appropriately disposed as taught by the '124 patent so as to reliably, effectively and economically supply coating material in the printing machine. The mere application of a well known doctor blade chamber device based upon its well known properties and intended use by those having ordinary skill in the art in order to achieve certain expected outcome would have involved no unobviousness. With respect to the "wherein" clause recited in each of claims 13-20, MPEP 2106 (page 2100-7) specifically states that "wherein" clauses are language that suggests and makes optional but does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The combined teachings of the applied prior art references also render claims 13-20 obvious.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren Yan whose telephone number is (703) 308-0978. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hilten, can be reached on (703) 308-0719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-5841.

Ren Yan

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan September 1, 2000